

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14-17 are pending in the application. Claims 7, 8, 12, 14, and 16 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-6 have been canceled, without prejudice. No claims have been added.

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-15 as being considered unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Applicant's prior art (hereinafter "APA") and Kanda et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,721,798 (hereinafter "Kanda"). Claims 16-17 were rejected as being considered unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over APA and Kanda, and further in view of Cannon, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,973,127 (hereinafter "Cannon").

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner stated that "it would have been obvious ... to modify APA to have two guide pins connect between the waveguide device and the connector as taught by Kanda et al., in order to easy and highly reproducible." (Office Action of 2/5/03, page 2, bottom 3 lines, to page 3, lines 1-2)

Applicant has amended claim 12 to include "permanently bonding the fiber optic bundle to the array waveguide." Amended claim 12 also recites "coarsely aligning the fiber optic bundle with the array waveguide...and finely aligning the fiber optic bundle with the array waveguide." Kanda does not teach or suggest permanent bonding of a fiber optic bundle to an array waveguide nor coarse and fine alignment of a fiber optic bundle and an array waveguide.

Additionally, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to combine APA with Kanda. APA discloses a method of **permanently coupling** a fiber optic bundle and an array waveguide. (See Specification, page 1, lines 16-17). Kanda, in contrast, describes a method of **removably connecting** an optical connector and an optical waveguide. (Kanda abstract). Applicant submits it would not have been



obvious to combine a method of permanently coupling devices with a method of temporarily coupling two devices. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claim 12 patentably distinguishes over APA and Kanda.

Applicant has amended claim 7 to incorporate the limitations of cancelled claim 6. Additionally, claim 7 has been amended to include the limitation of "permanently bonding the fiber optic bundle to the array waveguide." Kanda does not teach or suggest permanent bonding of a fiber optic bundle to an array waveguide nor finely aligning optical fibers in the fiber optic bundle with channels of the array waveguide." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 7 patentably distinguishes over APA and Kanda.

Given that claims 8-11, 14-15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 7 and 12, respectively, it is further submitted that claims 8-11, 14-15 also patentably distinguish over APA and Kanda. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-12, 14-15 are now allowable.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from amended claim 12, and include the limitations of "coarsely aligning the fiber optic bundle with the array waveguide...and finely aligning the fiber optic bundle with the array waveguide." APA and Kanda do not teach or suggest such coarse and fine alignment. Cannon also does not teach or suggest such coarse and fine alignment. In fact Cannon teaches away from claims 16 and 17, by teaching that the pins must be "forced into such channels and are received therein with a playless fit." (Cannon, col. 10, lines 16-18). Thus, there would be no way to make any fine alignment.

Thus, Applicant submits that claims 16 and 17 patentably distinguish over APA and Kanda, further in view of Cannon. Applicant submits that claims 16 and 17 are now allowable.



If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account  
Number 02-2666.

Very truly yours,

Dated: 6/5/03 Charles K. Young  
Charles K. Young  
Registration No.: 39,435

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(408) 720-8300

FAX RECEIVED

JUN 05 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800